



RE: DEQ input on RP response to EPA comments on Gasco EE /CA 📎

Sean Sheldrake to: BAYUK Dana

02/16/2013 10:28 AM

Cc: GAINER Tom, "Lance Peterson (PetersonLE@cdm.com)",
PETERSON Jenn L, POULSEN Mike

Thanks Dana--we'll have a look and let you know if we have any questions.

S

Sean Sheldrake, RPM, Unit Diving Officer
USEPA, Region 10
Environmental Cleanup Office
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900, ECL-110
Seattle WA 98101-3140
sheldrake.sean@epa.gov
Phone: 206.553.1220
Region 10 Dive Unit: <http://www.epa.gov/region10/dive>

Like us on Facebook! <http://www.facebook.com/EPADivers>

Portland Harbor Cleanup: <http://www.epa.gov/region10/portlandharbor>

Green Cleanups: <http://yosemite.epa.gov/R10/extaff.nsf/programs/greencleanups>

Green Cleanups (EPA only):

<http://204.47.216.153:9876/r10/infopage/cleanup.nsf/webpage/greener+cleanups>

Health and Safety (EPA only): <http://204.47.216.153:9876/r10/infopage/cleanup.nsf/webpage/H&SecI>

EPA Divers only: <http://204.47.216.153:9876/r10/infopage/cleanup.nsf/webpage/DSBtechdirector>

Deliveries: Parking Garage mailroom (1st floor)

Visitors: Check-in @ PERC / Service Center on 12th floor:

<http://yosemite.epa.gov/r10/extaff.nsf/Homepage/Visiting+Seattle>

BAYUK Dana

Afternoon Sean. In an e-mail sent January 11th (...)

02/15/2013 04:45:32 PM

From: BAYUK Dana <BAYUK.Dana@deq.state.or.us>
To: Sean Sheldrake/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "Lance Peterson (PetersonLE@cdm.com)" <PetersonLE@cdm.com>, BAYUK Dana <BAYUK.Dana@deq.state.or.us>, GAINER Tom <GAINER.Tom@deq.state.or.us>, PETERSON Jenn L <PETERSON.Jenn@deq.state.or.us>, POULSEN Mike <POULSEN.Mike@deq.state.or.us>
Date: 02/15/2013 04:45 PM
Subject: RE: DEQ input on RP response to EPA comments on Gasco EE/CA

Afternoon Sean.

In an e-mail sent January 11th (see below) Lance requested our feedback on NW Natural & Siltronic responses to certain comments included in the EPA Draft EECA comment set. The comments in Lance's list were authored by DEQ or related to groundwater source control. This e-mail provides DEQ's feedback on the status of the NW Natural & Siltronic responses to those comments.

I understand we are not preparing detailed replies to the NW Natural &

Siltronic responses at this time, and that you're most interested in knowing whether DEQ believes the two companies response(s) resolved the corresponding Draft EECA comments.

The replies provided below are organized into two groups (Group 1 and Group 2) consistent with Lance's e-mail. For each NW Natural & Siltronic response listed in Lance's e-mail I've indicated whether DEQ believes the comment is resolved or unresolved, and if unresolved a brief statement is provided as to why. There is at least one response I need to follow-up on (response to Comment #74).

GROUP 1 COMMENTS

Comment #44 - UNRESOLVED

In general, it appears the NW Natural & Siltronic response dismisses, mischaracterizes, or misrepresents the supporting information referenced by EPA in the comment. I can't speak specifically to each of the NW Natural & Siltronic responses, but using the HC&C system as an example, the response implies the system is: 1) designed and approved for construction for the in-water project (it is not); and 2) being constructed to operate in "perpetuity" (it is not). Furthermore, although the NW Natural & Siltronic response attempts to question the validity of each specific item in the comment, it does not speak to the broader issue identified by EPA; that is the underlying assumptions and range of alternatives presented in the Draft EECA heavily favor less remedial action(s).

Comment #84 - UNRESOLVED

Currently, the principal disagreements between NW Natural & Siltronic and DEQ on the Fill WBZ interceptor trench remain unresolved. The principal disagreements involve the alignment and timing of construction of the trench. DEQ believes NW Natural's disagreements and Siltronic's concerns about construction timing and trench alignment have been considered and are addressed by our recommended approach. A December 7, 2011 letter to both companies communicates our position and our decision.

By June 30, 2013, NW Natural is going to submit a work plan for evaluating the interceptor trench alignment recommended by DEQ. DEQ expects the work plan to kick-off further discussions regarding the timing of construction and alignment of the trench.

Comment #85 - UNRESOLVED

DEQ considers the substantive portion of this comment to be related to the groundwater modeling results presented in the Draft EECA. Consequently, the entire 1st paragraph of the response is unsupported, as the requested model documentation has not yet been provided for review.

Comment #86 - UNRESOLVED

DEQ does not consider the HC&C system to be a "permanent, long-term remedy for the overall Gasco property cleanup." The HC&C system is currently considered a removal action whose primary purpose is to prevent contaminated groundwater in the Alluvium WBZ from migrating to the river while operating in a manner that minimizes DNAPL mobilization. The role of the HC&C system in the overall final uplands remedy will be evaluated in the uplands FS.

Comment #91 - UNRESOLVED

Based on the reference to their Comment #86 response, NW Natural & Siltronic appear to respond to this comment by indicating the dissolved phase contamination associated with liquid and non-liquid MGP waste deeper than 3-feet will be addressed by the HC&C system. This may not be a given for locations where sediments are impacted by MGP waste such as tar and oil, even if the HC&C system is effective. Depending on type, extent, and thickness, the presence of MGP waste below the river could reduce the hydraulic effect of the HC&C system as the MGP waste has lower permeability than sediments. In other words, the presence of MGP waste could reduce the hydraulic connection between the HC&C system and river.

Comment #99 - UNRESOLVED

DEQ agrees the costs for demolishing and replacing uplands SCMs are a consideration in the Draft EECA. DEQ does disagree that the Draft EECA should only evaluate the complete demolition and replacement of SCMs and use this scenario to support limitation or elimination of remedial alternatives. If the costs of removing and replacing uplands SCMs are significant factors in evaluating and selecting certain alternatives, then NW Natural & Siltronic should propose additional reasonable technically based scenarios that do not involve full removal and replacement of groundwater SCMs.

DEQ acknowledges that NW Natural has committed to modifying the HC&C system to accommodate the in-water sediment project if needed. Regarding the Fill WBZ interceptor trench, NW Natural & Siltronic have created an artificial situation to justify a single desired approach (i.e., construction of the trench at the top of the riverbank after the in-water project is complete). DEQ does not accept NW Natural's & Siltronic's portrayal of the situation, or approve the two company's desired approach. Furthermore, DEQ rejects: 1) the sentence indicating that; "DEQ to date has not provided technical responses to the positions taken by NW Natural in previous source control design reports;" and 2) the last sentence in the same paragraph.

GROUP 2 COMMENTS

Comment #26 - UNRESOLVED

DEQ does not accept the NW Natural & Siltronic assertion that comments regarding BaPEq RALs provided during review of the Draft EECA are invalid because similar comments were not provided subsequent to the EECA Technical Briefing.

For what it's worth regarding the scope of RAO 1, I understood substantial product that didn't meet the specific SOW criteria for removal, but which represented potential future unacceptable risk would be factored into removal scenarios for the Draft EECA where cost would be a consideration.

I note NW Natural & Siltronic do not attempt to respond to the last paragraph of EPA's comment, which repeats the assertion that the Draft EECA skews the evaluation of alternatives, in this case to eliminate the most robust cleanup alternative (Alternative #5).

Comment #73 - RESOLVED

This comment is resolved if NW Natural's commitment to evaluate gasoline-range hydrocarbons applies the next version of the EECA, including conducting and incorporating data screening into the document.

Comment #74 - ?

I will need to follow-up with the author of this comment and get back to you on the status.

Comment #78 - RESOLVED

This comment appears to be resolved. That said, NW Natural's commitment to pick up the issue after resolution in the Portland Harbor draft FS process should be confirmed. Alternatively, if it is already agreed that certain lines of evidence (such as surface water) were incorrectly dropped, then there is no reason to wait on the draft Portland Harbor draft FS process to include them in the revised EECA.

Comment #79 - UNRESOLVED

The review of Appendix G requires a significant effort and commitment of resources. To date, DEQ has not undertaken review of the appendix. Further discussions regarding the appendix are warranted to coordinate reviews between EPA, DEQ, and other interested stakeholders; and develop a timeframe for completing the review.

Comment #100 - RESOLVED

This comment is resolved as long as NW Natural is also agreeing to fully

incorporate the findings and conclusions of the approved uplands risk assessment and hot spot determination into the sediment project.

Let me know if you have questions regarding this e-mail and I hope you have a great holiday weekend.

Dana

From: Peterson, Lance [PetersonLE@cdmsmith.com]
Sent: Friday, January 11, 2013 10:39 AM
To: BAYUK Dana
Subject: DEQ input on RP response to EPA comments on Gasco EE/CA

Dana, as a follow-up to our conversation on 1/8, I have called out the "GW SCM"-related comments authored by DEQ. DEQ's perspective on NWN/Siltronic responses would be helpful as CDM works to draft responses to the RP's responses.

- * Comment 44: has a HC&C piece to the comment, the rest are big picture topics
- * Comment 84: deals with Fill WBZ trench timing
- * Comment 85: GW model + COI decay in sediments
- * Comment 86: GW SCM application topic
- * Comment 91: GW SCM application topic
- * Comment 99: RB remediation coord. w/ upland SCMs, and Fill WBZ trench timing

For your information, the other DEQ authored comments include #26 (combined DEQ/EPA comment), #73, #74, #78, #79 and #100. I was wondering for #79 if you have any update on any further DEQ review of Appendix G (data screening)?

=====
Lance E. Peterson, RG, LHG
Senior Project Manager
CDM Smith
14432 SE Eastgate Way, Suite 100, Bellevue, WA 98007
425-519-8300 (office) | 425-519-8382 (direct) | 425-417-5946 (mobile) |
425-746-0197 (fax)
mailto:petersonle@cdmsmith.com | cdmsmith.com<UrlBlockedError.aspx>